DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 313 755 CS 506 966

AUTHOR Yellin, Keith
TITLE Public Speaking Teleprompters: The "Secret" Continues.
PUB DATE Nov 89
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (75th, San Francisco, CA, November 18-21, 1989).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Communication Research; *Communication Skills; Higher Education; Mass Media Role; Media Research; *Persuasive Discourse; Political Candidates; Public Officials; *Public Speaking; Television
IDENTIFIERS Ghostwriting; *Orators; Oratory; Political Communication; *Teleprompters

ABSTRACT

An empirical study examined politicians' use of public speaking teleprompters (PSTs) when delivering major addresses to determine if audiences made aware of this practice would more seriously question speaker credibility, sincerity, and communicative ability. After completing an initial survey about political attitudes and awareness, subjects, 36 undergraduates at a large midwestern university, were asked to watch three 30-second video clips of George Bush's 1988 nomination acceptance address: one clip showed only face and upper torso; another clip revealed PST plates from the front, and the third clip presented the PST platter from behind, allowing the subjects to watch the text scroll upward as Bush read it. After each clip the subjects were asked to fill out an instrument measuring perceptions of speaker skill, credibility, and means of delivery. Then the subjects were told about PSTs and were asked to fill out a final questionnaire, asking for their attitudes about PSTs and their past cognizance of them. Results revealed that subjects' reservations about the teleprompter did not significantly undermine ratings of speaker competence and credibility during subject exposure to obviously teleprompted oratorical displays. Greater concern surfaced after an informational lecture on the system. Findings suggest that greater exposure of the PST could lead to more serious questioning of oratorical ethics and leadership. When unseen, PSTs conceal the large degree to which public officials now depend on ghostwriters. (Eighteen references and one appendix including survey questions and results are attached.) (KEH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED313755

PUBLIC SPEAKING TELEPROMPTERS: THE "SECRET" CONTINUES

Keith Yellin

November 1989

Department of Communication Studies

University of Iowa

Iowa City, IA 52242

CS506966

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Keith Yellin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Earlier I speculated that most Americans are unaware their politicians are delivering major addresses from public speaking teleprompters (PSTs); this ignorance stems from deliberate deception; and if this deception were exposed, audiences would more seriously question speaker credibility, sincerity, and communicative ability (Yellin). I have since conducted a small empirical study which seems to corroborate my first hypothesis and qualify the third. As for the reason behind audience ignorance of the PST, I have decided that the cause goes beyond deliberate deception.[1]

The subjects for the study (see appendix for method) consisted of 36 university undergraduates, essentially half upperclass and half underclass, half female and half male, half Republican in their leanings and half Democratic, and 11% ethnic minorities. Typically they were not very informed about or committed to politics, they received most of their information about national politics through television (particularly network or cable television), and they ranged in age from 17 to 26, most being between 18 and 21. Over 90% of the subjects considered public speaking ability to be "extremely" or highly important for national public officials.

My tests indicated that half of the sample knew nothing about public speaking teleprompters before the study. Nearly three-quarters of them had never noticed the one-way mirrors

---

[1] My interest is in public speaking teleprompters rather than the in-camera, studio type. TelePrompTer is the trademark of a monitor-prompting equipment manufacturer. The name, however, like Kleenex or Xerox, has become a proper noun used generically.

(hereafter referred to as "teleprompter plates") which are the telltale element of the teleprompter. Of the quarter who had noticed the teleprompter plates previously, approximately half knew their purpose (even if only vaguely), and half guessed them to be some sort of protective device. When exposed to a typical "tight" television shot of an orator being teleprompted (plates not visible), most subjects supposed the address was being delivered "from memory" (44%) or "by some other means" (47%). "From memory" was the most popular response (69%) to a larger, frontal shot (plates visible). Even when exposed to a shot from behind the orator, when teleprompted text could be seen scrolling on the back of the plates, one-third of the subjects believed the speech was being delivered from memory. Audiences thus attribute much oratory to the art of memory rather than the advance of technology.

Toward the end of the experiment, after being formally informed about the PST, 17 subjects were not concerned about teleprompted public speech "at all," 17 were concerned "somewhat," and two were "very much" concerned. Those who were unconcerned generally considered the teleprompter to be a high-tech notecard system necessary for long and complex speeches. Those who were concerned (to a greater or lesser degree) found teleprompted speech to be robotic, less sincere, and/or a poor reflection of an orator's true abilities.

Interestingly, and at odds with my previous suspicions, reservations about the teleprompter did not significantly undermine ratings of speaker competence and credibility during subject

exposure to obviously teleprompted oratorical displays. Greater and lesser concern surfaced after an informational lecture on the system; and those who disapproved of speech by PST tended to be more critical of the given speaker in the first place. Thus it appears that teleprompter use is frowned upon, when it is frowned upon, only after persons are fully informed of the system and asked specifically if the practice disturbs them.

How half the sample--drawn from a youthful, "high-tech age" population at that--can be unaware of the PST will be discussed later in this paper. First I will probe the relatively apathetic initial reaction to teleprompted public speech and the reasons that apathy is misplaced. Then I will argue that teleprompted public speech is worthy of further scrutiny and exposure. My finding that the PST disturbed over half of the sample once it paused to really consider the device suggests there are ethical concerns about its use, but those concerns are not easily stirred.

I was somewhat surprised when nearly half of my sample responded that it did "not care at all whether politicians employ teleprompters." In retrospect, however, this reaction is consistent with communication scholarship, since as far as I can tell no scholar has studied the PST in its 25 years of existence.[2] Bruce Gronbeck seems to speak for the field when he contends "teleprompter technology is merely replacing . . . memory" (Memorandum). Thus one who is critical of the PST risks joining

---

[2] An examination of political convention addresses indicates Lyndon Johnson was the first president to employ the PST.

the company of reactionaries who decried writing in ancient times, and the calculator and computer more recently. All three of these technologies have replaced human memory, freeing the mind from toiling with relatively simple information or operations. In so doing they have allowed "more original, more abstract thought" (Ong 24). The PST may seem an analogous expansion of artificial memory, but it is different and troublesome in distinct ways.

The literate classical orator, Gronbeck reminds us, was trained in techniques of memory "that freed the orator from the shunned manuscript, that allowed the orator to project spontaneity and to maintain eye contact, that gave the orator control at a word-by-word level of discursiveness" (Memorandum). If the PST is "merely" replacing memory, then it should provide the orator with these same assets at negligible qualitative cost. But the PST does not free orators from a manuscript, it only frees them from one which is visible to the audience. Memory is not visible to the audience either, but eye contact is undisguised during speeches which employ memoria. There are no (smoke and) mirrors before the speaker relying on memory; glazed or momentarily averted eyes, common behavior when searching one's memory too intently, are recognizable by the audience. The position and one-way clarity of PST plates, on the other hand, allow speakers to look toward--but not at--their audience while reading their text. For the audience, the speaker's gaze is deceptive in the same way that a person who looks at his or her reflection in a shop window appears to those inside to be looking at them.

The art of memory was a crucial canon in classical rhetoric. It consisted of techniques which enabled orators to deliver long speeches from memory with tremendous accuracy. Frances Yates explains classical mnemonics:

> The first step was to imprint on the memory a series of loci or places. The commonest, though not the only, type of mnemonic place system used was the architectural type. . . . The images by which the speech is to be remembered [i.e., images representing points of the speech] are then placed in imagination on the places which have been memorised in the building. This done, as soon as the memory of the facts requires to be revived, all these places are visited in turn and the various deposits demanded of their custodians. We have to think of the ancient orator as moving in imagination through his memory building whilst he is making his speech, drawing from the memorised places the images he has placed on them. The method ensures that the points are remembered in the right order, since the order is fixed by the sequence of places in the building. (3)

As popular and refined as ancient mnemonics were, neither the Rhetorica Ad Herennium (222-23), nor Cicero (188), nor Quintilian (241) encouraged verbatim memorization. Practiced orators, it was argued, need only commit concepts to memory, because specific words come easily to them and verbatim memorization can lead to hesitant speech. Classical speech by memoria was thus extemporaneous--with the speech outline in the speaker's head. It allowed spontaneous word control.

In political oratory the fourth canon has increasingly given way to manuscript speech because of today's requirements for precise language and because most national politicians deliver speeches written by someone else. Before the PST, however, ghosted manuscript speech easily lent itself to the addition or omission of orators' ideas. Even immediately before delivery, orators could add thoughts in the margin or scratch things out.

During delivery orators could spontaneously depart from their prepared text and easily return to it at their leisure.

In contrast, today's orators working from PSTs must stick to the script. Because the teleprompted image of the text stems from a staffed script-table or computer off stage, there is little last-minute opportunity for orators to fiddle with their manuscript. Because only a few lines of a teleprompted manuscript are visible to orators at any given time, and because the scroll-speed-control is not in their hands, such orators are at the mercy of a preconceived, removed text and the PST operator. It is not possible for orators to skip ahead, should the audience seem to be losing interest. It is more difficult for orators to repeat or rephrase a passage, should the audience seem to be lost. Thus teleprompted public speech differs significantly from manuscript or conceptually memorized speech. Discursiveness cannot be controlled at the word-by-word, or even the concept by concept, level.

Books, calculators, and computers are useful because they relieve users from remembering or recalculating "little" things, like Tristan loves Iseult, or 7 X 7 = 49. This enables information to be more easily mixed and matched in unique, more complex combinations. Readers, for instance, may put down one book to read a better one, or quickly refer to another to bolster the meaning of the first. Likewise calculator or computer users decide, even if inadvertently, when and what to process. Human memory works comparably during impromptu and extemporaneous speech. During such events speakers mix, match, and stack bits

of memory to conceive and/or articulate ideas. Teleprompted speech--manuscript speech residing not only outside of the heads but out of the hands of orators--is essentially immutable.

What are the implications of a device which removes nearly all oratorical control from speakers--and yet makes speakers appear to be "in total command of [their] speech material . . . in total command of [their] audience" (Q-TV Telesync)? Barbara Tuchman, speaking with Bill Moyers, explains:

> [T]he trouble is that our public men are really artificial. They're created by the most devastating tool that technology's invented, which is the TelePrompTer. They don't speak spontaneously. You don't hear them meet a situation out of their own minds. They read this thing that's going along there in front of them. Words that have been created for them by PR men or by advertisers or whatever. And this is not the real man that we see. And it allows an inadequate, minor individual to appear to be a statesman. . . . (4)

Tuchman's concerns, then, parallel mine, that "the public-speaking teleprompter cultivates a fraudulent appearance of communicative and intellectual competence" (Yellin 7).

Consider a typical performance of the "Great Communicator," Ronald Reagan, in the twilight of his presidency. On 16 December 1988, he delivered a half-hour foreign policy address at the University of Virginia. This speech, sensitive to its immediate audience, waxes poetic about Thomas Jefferson's contributions to the United States and suggests Jeffersonian precepts can still guide contemporary foreign policy. Reagan delivers the teleprompted address at a steady 152 words a minute, exuding his typical oratorical confidence and ease, turning gently to face one half of his audience and then the other. When viewing the address at high speed, however, the president's pivoting becomes

mechanical, incredibly precise in timing and angles. Returned to regular speed, the glances that once seemed casual and caring are revealed to be the gyrations of a practiced telepromptee: he reads from one teleprompter plate for four seconds, and then from the other for four seconds--for more than thirty minutes.

The plates are unobtrusive from the observer's perspective. Only transparent "shields" are visible to the immediate audience. The television audience, exposed primarily to a "tight" picture of the president, probably does not even notice these. To prevent drawing attention to the plates, to perpetuate an image of extemporaneous speech, the president consults written notes when he recalls Jefferson's epitaph, a depiction of Jefferson by the Federalists, etc.[3] In fact the eloquent president is depending mightily on the little-noticed PST plates. This is most obvious during his transition from prepared text to the question-and-answer session. The president concludes his formal, generally serious address majestically:

> A great future is ours and the world's if we but remember the power of [Jefferson's] words. Mr. Jefferson penned, not just for Americans but for all humanity, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Thank you, and God bless you.

Not surprisingly, an eruption of applause follows as Reagan graciously steps away from the lectern and beams in appreciation. After he takes his seat and the applause subsides, University of Virginia President Robert O'Neil publicly addresses the president

---

[3] This practice is common PST fare. In his first address to Congress on 9 February 1989, for instance, a teleprompted George Bush apparently referred to lectern notes to quote Lincoln.

from the lectern: "Could one possibly be other than moved by those words? Mr. President, your address fully met our very high expectations." O'Neil's remarks are delivered seriously, but one wonders if the university president isn't poking a little fun at Reagan. O'Neil had been seated behind and just to the right of Reagan during the presidential address. Plainly he watched the president read the entire speech. Were "those words" really Reagan's? Was autonomous, spontaneous thought a criterion of the university's "very high expectations"? O'Neil seems to answer these questions. After informing the audience that Reagan will answer six student questions, he concludes in thinly veiled sarcasm: "I will leave the rest to the president in complete confidence." Knowing laughter follows.

O'Neil's final remark and the response it draws demonstrate that Americans are well familiar with their long-time president. Reagan is master of the prepared text--and the ad-lib faux pas. Audiences thus seem aware of his dependence on prepared material. My empirical study suggests, however, that most people believe it is flexible memory--not inflexible teleprompted text--which allows Reagan's oratorical feats. Vigorous applause erupts again as the president returns to his station behind the teleprompter plates. Now facing Reagan blankly, unhelpfully, the plates appear unchanged, still protective, from the audience's perspective. The first student asks Reagan:

> Mr. President. . . . [c]onsidering that Lenin claimed that the Soviets should let capitalist countries fund the building of communism, I'd like to know what is your position on granting most favored nation status to the Soviet Union, and do you think if we do grant this

> status, that it will help promote democracy in the Soviet Union?

The president responds:

> Well, we want to help promote Congress--and, er, the um--this democracy in the Soviet Union, but I believe that we still--uh--we've got to proceed by watching whether deeds, uh, match the words. Now in some instances, uh, they certainly have, uh, permitting me, for example, to speak to the students at the University of Moscow. I found out afterward, however, that they couldn't get the, all the student body in, only a few hundred, so [the president breaks into a grin] they decided that the few hundred would be those who were members of the Young Communist League. [Laughter]

Having found his anecdotal footing, Reagan reduces his seemingly uncharacteristic vocalized pauses and recounts a tale about his and Mikhail Gorbachev's first meeting. In short order he elicits robust laughter from his audience four more times. But the president never touches Lenin, most favored nation status, or promoting democracy in the Soviet Union--the elements of the question. He is, without his teleprompter, merely an old but entertaining story-teller, a stand-up comedian of sorts.

Certainly Reagan's simple, optimistic, nice guy demeanor contributes to his immense popularity. More significantly, I think, the PST transforms this intellectually simple man into such an eloquent genius that nothing else he does can return him to the ranks of the Teflon-free. The PST gets his foot in the door so magnificently, few persons find the inclination or the strength to ask him to leave. Some scholars attribute Reagan's oratorical success to his more colloquial, intimate, narrative style (Jamieson, Lewis). But certainly the PST deserves much of the credit. If Reagan had to rely on visible text to deliver his addresses, he would be less mesmerizing. The head bobbing that

accompanies manuscript or notecard delivery, and the visible reminder that the speaker's words are probably not his own, may have prevented Reagan from winning the hearts and minds of so many Americans. Memorizing such lengthy addresses, to an extemporaneous or verbatim degree, would have necessitated more intellectual work on the president's part and probably reduced the number of his brilliant performances.

I do not mean to pick on Ronald Reagan. At least he can tell stories on his own. George Bush requires the PST to even do this. Indeed, one of the video clips used in my empirical study shows Bush addressing the 1988 Republican National Convention from behind. From this view, one can read a portion of Bush's speech at the same time he does:

> When I was working on this part of the speech, Barbara came in and asked what I was doing. And I looked up, and I said I'm working hard. And she said, Oh dear, don't worry, relax, sit back, take off your shoes, and put up your silver foot. [Laughter, Applause]

Rather than referring to a note like "Barbara--silver foot" to jog his memory, Bush relies on the PST to recount even intimate dialogue between him and his wife. It makes one wonder if such a conversation ever really occurred.

I do not mean to be politically partisan either, though Michael Dukakis did not employ the PST to the extent the Bush did during the 1988 presidential campaign.[4] The point is that PSTs fabricate the "conversational, spontaneous, eyes-up" oratory that audiences are particularly fond of (Yellin 6).

---

[4] CNN Headline News campaign coverage in October 1988 showed that Bush invariably employed the PST for addresses to city, state, and university audiences, while Dukakis did not.

All of this suggests that PSTs abet the disturbing practice of ghostwriting in national politics. When teleprompted speakers no longer refer to visible texts, even audiences which are cognizant of ghostwriting are apt to forget that the orator's words are not his or her own. When teleprompted speakers do hold manuscripts but hardly refer to them (a common practice), the impression is that the prepared text is being superseded by a bold and active mind. Teleprompted public speech has thus made giving speeches authored by others easier and more convincing than ever before.

Much that is troublesome about ghostwriting is underscored by the PST. Kathleen Jamieson's concern that ghostwriting "has sundered speaking from thinking, the act of delivering a message from the process of conceiving it" (204) seems doubly true for teleprompted speech. Ghosted addresses of candidates for high political office provide us with few clues as to what such people really think, how they think, and how they articulate their ideas. Teleprompted addresses hide these things from us most perfectly: Through technological deception which involves "the manipulative use of contextual features to generate a false framing of the situation" (Hopper 289), audiences are led to believe that teleprompted orators speak "from memory," or extemporaneously. In fact, such addresses leave us "clueless" as to how such orators fare intellectually and communicatively without the "shadow play of words."[5]

---

[5] Plato, "The Sophist," 268d.

One of the reasons Jamieson condemns ghostwriting is because it deprives orators (and their constituents) of the growth leaders experience when they try to translate their thoughts into language (232).[6] This circumstance is heightened by the PST because its physical design enables an orator to deliver a speech with "convincing" eye contact while reading it for the first time. Speakers thus no longer need to associate themselves with their speeches for more than one, perfunctory reading. Franklin Roosevelt and John Kennedy relied on ghosted texts. But in order to deliver manuscript speeches with substantial eye contact, they had to review the manuscript before final delivery. This, even if it did not lead to their editing and contributing to the text, resulted in their internalizing to some degree what they said publicly. Today the PST undermines the need for familiarity with one's text. Surely this can only aggravate the inconsistency in statements which arises from politicians relying on a number of speechwriters, a number of minds, to supply them with an endless flow of quickly dispatched addresses.

How can it be that the PST apparently does not undermine perceptions of speaker competence and credibility unless persons are forced to dwell on the issue (and, perhaps, are less than sympathetic to the given orator initially)? In essence, our sensibilities have been dulled by the wholesale practice of ghostwriting. Senator Joseph Biden was hounded from the field of

---

[6] For example, I know what I have discovered and contemplated about PSTs. Writing this paper, however, forces me to reconsider, refine, and order my ideas. As a result, my thinking is clearer and more consistent than it was originally.

1988 presidential contenders when it was discovered that he had incorporated without credit the words of British Labor Party leader Neil Kinnock into two of his speeches. But most or all of Biden's other speeches, like those of his competitors, were conceived by some person or persons other than himself. His mistake was he pushed the now very peculiar boundaries of plagiarism too far (Lyne).

Teleprompted orators, the news media, and scholars of communication (especially of rhetorical studies) must bear some responsibility for the general ignorance and indifference surrounding the 25-year-old PST. Naturally orators try not to draw attention to the device. Their reference to visible notes to quote someone when they could just as easily, if not more easily, read the quotation right off the teleprompter plates is deception, pure and simple. Teleprompted orators prefer to cultivate the appearance that they are eloquent and important, extemporaneous speakers protected by bulletproof glass. Many subjects in my sample fell for this "sham."[7]

Television news has also avoided drawing attention to the PST. Commentators mention it now and then, and occasionally cable news will show rear, text-revealing camera shots. All of this is haphazard and fleeting, however. The network news programs are especially guilty of televising major addresses precisely in the way orators would like them to. Armed with advanced copies of speech texts, television directors at national conventions are able and willing to frame images that heighten

[7] A word used by one of my subjects.

the sentimentality of major speeches rather than detract from them. Thus, instead of seeing that an orator is robotically reading text and not sincerely looking at his or her audience and thinking, television viewers see attentive elderly persons precisely when orators refer to the elderly, thoughtful women precisely when orators refer to women, well-acculturated Hispanics precisely when orators refer to minorities, etc. As long as media cheerleading continues, so will much ignorance of the PST.

Finally, scholars of rhetorical studies have ignored the PST. In its haste to purse ideology, epistemology, and the like, the field has neglected in contemporary rhetoric what Quintilian considered sufficiently important to write entire books on: invention, memory, and delivery. The development of what Walter Ong has termed "secondary orality" (136-38) suggests it is time to take another, more sophisticated look at these canons. Perhaps the first order of business for rhetoricians is to update their public speaking textbooks. For even if they are hesitant to challenge the ethicality of the PST, they should not shy from challenging its "secrecy" and letting others judge it. My survey of popular university and high school speech textbooks (Lucas, Osborn, HopKins) indicates that young people are only being informed about four methods of delivery: impromptu, extemporaneous, memorized, and manuscript. Teleprompted speech, of course, is a technological variation of the manuscript speech. None of these textbooks discuss this, however. True, most students cannot and probably never will deliver teleprompted

speeches; but to enumerate delivery methods and fail to mention this popular and consequential type does nothing to break down the current ignorance and indifference about PSTs.

My small empirical study suggests that greater exposure of the PST could lead to more serious questioning of oratorical ethics and leadership. When unseen, PSTs conceal the fantastic degree to which public officials now depend on ghostwriters. Revealed as the combination of script-table, video monitors, and one-way mirrors that it is, the PST suggests that staff, not orator, are creating addresses. Perhaps even limited scorn of teleprompted public speech would result in some orators opting to quit the PST altogether. For as long as an orator stands behind teleprompter plates, it is difficult for a PST-cognizant audience to be impressed. The audience cannot tell when the orator is reading from the PST and when he or she is not.

Appendix

Method

Thirty-six subjects were drawn from two undergraduate communications classes at a large midwestern university. The study began with a survey covering subjects' political attitudes and awareness, as well subjects' relevant experiences that may have given subjects detailed information regarding PSTs.

After completing the initial survey, the subjects were asked to watch a 30-second video clip of George Bush delivering his 1988 nomination acceptance address. The camera shot did not reveal anything but Bush's face and upper torso. The subjects then filled out an instrument measuring perceptions of speaker skill, credibility, and means of delivery. Next, the subjects were shown another 30-second video clip from the same speech. In this clip, teleprompter plates were visible from the front, as they are usually shown (when they are shown) on television. The subjects then filled out the same instrument to measure any changes. Finally, the subjects were shown a third clip of Bush's speech. This time the subjects could see Bush and the teleprompter plates from behind. They could watch the speech text scroll upward on the teleprompter plates as Bush read it. The subjects then filled out the instrument a third and final time.

At this point the subjects were told about PSTs--what they are, how they are used, and who employs them. Then the subjects were asked to fill out a final questionnaire, asking for their attitudes about PSTs and their past cognizance of them. Questions and means for all instruments are reported below in the results section.

The 30-second video clips approximate generous sound bites, by network evening news standards. Bush was chosen to represent major contemporary political figures who regularly employ the PST. Subjects may have had trouble viewing him objectively, however: 71.4% of the Democrats were critical of teleprompter use (first question of Survey 3), compared to 41.2% of the Republicans; Independents and Others split almost evenly.

Results

Survey 1

Question:	
Number of newspaper readings weekly	5.78/week
How often subjects talk about national politics	2.75/week
How often subjects watch TV news	3.75/week
Percentage who consider themselves Republican	47.2%
Percentage who consider themselves Democratic	38.9%
Percentage who consider themselves Independent	5.6%
Percentage who consider themselves Other	8.3%
How important subjects feel public speaking is for public officials (from 1-7, 7 being extremely important)	6.41
Sex	male 44.4% female 55.6%
Mean age	20.00

Survey 2 - teleprompter plates not visible

Question:	
Perceived public speaking skill (from 1-7, 7 being excellent)	5.05
Perceived speaker credibility (from 1-7, 7 being excellent)	4.72
Perceived means of delivering speech:	
spontaneously	0.0%
memory	44.4%
some other means	55.5%

Survey 2 - teleprompter plates visible from front

Perceived public speaking skill (from 1-7, 7 being excellent)	4.61
Perceived speaker credibility (from 1-7, 7 being excellent)	4.08
Perceived means of delivering speech:	
spontaneously	2.9%
memory	68.6%
some other means	28.6%

Survey 2 - teleprompter plates visible from the rear

Perceived public speaking skill (from 1-7, 7 being excellent)	4.28
Perceived speaker credibility (from 1-7, 7 being excellent)	4.39
Perceived means of delivering speech:	
spontaneously	5.6%
memory	33.3%
some other means ("PSTs")	61.1%

Survey 3 - after subjects were informed about teleprompters

Question:	
Did subjects care whether politicians used PSTs?	
Not at all	47.2%
Yes, somewhat	47.2%
Yes, very much	5.5%
Percentage of subjects who had noticed PST plates	27.8%
Function subjects believed PST plates served among those subjects who had noticed them	
Protective device	38.5%
Teleprompter plates	46.1%
Did not wonder	15.4%
Novelty of information provided about PSTs	
Had not known	50.0%
Knew some details	44.4%
Knew all about them	5.6%

* * *

Acknowledgments: The author gratefully acknowledges the assistance of Geoff Leatham in the production of the empirical section of this paper. Professors Samuel Becker and Donovan Ochs provided helpful suggestions generally.

Works Cited

Bush, George H. W. Nomination Acceptance Address at the Republican National Convention. C-SPAN. New Orleans, 18 Aug. 1988.

Cicero, Marcus Tullius. On Oratory and Orators. Ed. J. S. Watson. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1986.

Gronbeck, Bruce. Memorandum to the author. 24 Nov. 1988.

HopKins, Mary Frances, Beverly Whitaker, and Bernard Brommel, eds. Contemporary Speech. Skokie, IL: National Textbook, 1982.

Hopper, Robert, and Robert A. Bell. "Broadening the Deception Construct." Quarterly Journal of Speech 70 (1984): 288-302.

Jamieson, Kathleen Hall. Eloquence in an Electronic Age: The Transformation of Political Speechmaking. New York: Oxford UP, 1988.

Lewis, William F. "Telling America's Story: Narrative Form and the Reagan Presidency." Quarterly Journal of Speech 73 (1987): 280-302.

Lucas, Stephen E. Art of Public Speaking. New York: Random, 1986.

Lyne, John. Discussion with the author. 24 April 1989.

Ong, Walter J. Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word. 1982. New York: Methuen, 1988.

Osborn, Michael, and Suzanne Osborn. Public Speaking. Boston: Houghton, 1988.

Q-TV Telesync. Advertising brochure. New York, 1988.

Quintilian, Marcus Fabius. Institutio Oratoria. Vol. 4. Trans. H. E. Butler. London: Heinemann, 1936.

Reagan, Ronald W. Address at the University of Virginia. C-SPAN. Charlottesville, 16 Dec. 1988.

Rhetorica Ad Herennium. Trans. Harry Caplan. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1954.

Tuchman, Barbara. Interview. World of Ideas. With Bill Moyers. Public Affairs Television, Inc. WNET, New York. 30 Sept. 1988.

Yates, Frances A. The Art of Memory. Chicago: Chicago UP, 1966.

Yellin, Keith. "Teleprompted Public Speaking." Iowa Journal of Speech Communication 21.1 (1989): 2-8.